

REMARKS

Applicants have the following response to the Final Rejection of August 22, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-4, 6, 13-16, 18 and 30-60 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 1, 13, 34, 39, 44 and 49 to recite “an electroluminescent layer formed over the insulating film and the anode [[and]], wherein the electroluminescent layer is in direct contact with a part of the anode.” It is respectfully submitted that this claim language is not indefinite.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also has the following rejections under 35 USC §103(a):

- A. Claims 1-4, 6, 13-16, 18, 30-33, 49-55, 59 and 60 as being unpatentable over Beesely (US 5,400,047) in view of Terao et al. (US 6,133,581)
- B. Claims 34-37 and 56 as being unpatentable over Beesely in view of Terao and further in view of Kusunoki et al. (US 6,570,321).
- C. Claim 38 as being unpatentable over Beesely in view of Terao in further view of Kusunoki, in further view of Codama et al. (US 6,037,712)
- D. Claims 39, 40-42, 44-47, 57 and 58 as being unpatentable over Beesely in view of Terao in further view of Kusunoki, in further view of Yokoi et al. (US 5,962,970).
- E. Claims 43 and 48 as being unpatentable over Beesely in view of Terao in further view of Kusunoki, in further view of Yokoi, in further view of Codama.

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 1, 13, 34, 39, 44 and 49 to recite “an electroluminescent layer formed over the insulating film and the anode, wherein the electroluminescent layer is in direct contact with a part of the anode” (underlining for emphasis). These features are supported, for example, by page 6, lns. 12-15 and Figs. 1B and 1C of the present application.

In contrast, the Final Rejection, on page 10 in the “Response to Arguments” states “[t]he Examiner notes that while Beesely does not show an EL layer in direct contact with the anode, Beesely does show the limitation in claim 1...[as] [t]he EL layer (58) is clearly in contact with a part of the anode (64) via layer 56” (emphasis in original). Hence, the Examiner admits that Beesely does not disclose the amended claimed feature of direct contact between the EL layer and the anode.

Therefore, independent Claims 1, 13, 34, 39, 44 and 49 and those claims dependent thereon are not disclosed by the cited references but are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 21, 2006

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.

200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 26568